AD-A075 738 STATE UNIV OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO DEPT OF ENGINEERIN--ETC F/G 20/11
A GENERAL UNIQUENESS THEOREM IN NONLINEAR VISCOELASTICITY WITH --ETC(U)
AUG 79 G A BECUS , F A COZZARELLI N00014-75-C-0302

UNCLASSIFIED 112 NL

| OF |

AD
A075738

END
DATE
FILMED
11-79
DDC

Department of Engineering Science
Aerospace Engineering and Nuclear Engineering

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCES

State University of New York at Buffalo

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK · BUFFALO ·

Report No. 112

A GENERAL UNIQUENESS THEOREM IN NONLINEAR VISCOELASTICITY WITH APPLICATION TO TEMPERATURE AND IRRADIATION INDUCED CREEP PROBLEMS*

by

Georges A. Bécus** and F. A. Cozzarelli

August, 1979

* This research was supported in part by the Office of Naval Research under Contract No. N00014-75-C-0302. Approved for public release. Distribution unlimited.

** Present address: Engineering Science Department, University of Cincinnati.

Abstract

A general uniqueness theorem is first derived for a general constitutive relation in the form of a nonlinear memory integral with aging included. Uniqueness is proved for the solution to the dynamic mixed boundary value problem with small deformations. The general theorem is then specialized to a constitutive equation of the isotropic power law type governing thermoirradiation induced creep.

1 - Introduction

Uniqueness theorems of solutions for infinitesimal creep in linear viscoelastic materials have been given by Gurtin and Sternberg [1], Edelstein and Gurtin [2], Odeh and Tadjbakhsh [3], Lubliner and Sackman [4], and others. Sackman [5] also gave a theorem for a material undergoing nonlinear infinitesimal quasi-static steady creep, with the elastic strain ignored. Recently Edelstein gave uniqueness theorems for nonlinear creep with transient creep included [6] for a special domain and loading, and with the transient creep excluded [7] for more general domains and loading. In [8], a uniqueness theorem was given for an isotropic nonlinear constitutive relation for thermal creep, which includes elastic strain, transient creep, material aging and creep compressibility. In the present paper we prove uniqueness for a constitutive relation which includes these same effects plus the additional effects of thermal expansion, irradiation swelling, thermo-irradiation induced creep, and temperature and flux dependent material properties. This constitutive relation is an extension of the one given in [9] using the time hardening (aging) procedure of [10].

A general uniqueness theorem is first derived in Section 2 for a general constitutive relation in the form of a nonlinear memory integral with aging included. Uniqueness is established for the dynamical mixed boundary value problem assuming small deformations. Then in Section 3 we specialize the general uniqueness theorem of Section 2 to the constitutive equation for temperature and irradiation induced creep mentioned above. We also comment on the applicability of the general theorem of Section 2 to a wide variety of other constitutive relations given in the literature.

2 - A general uniqueness theorem

Theorem. Let V be an open bounded region in R^3 with regular boundary $\partial V = \partial V_\sigma \cup \partial V_u$, $\partial V_\sigma \cap \partial V_u = \phi$, and let $\bar{V} = V \cup \partial V$. Let $\underset{\sim}{n}$ be the unit outward normal vector to ∂V. Let there be given vector functions $\underset{\sim}{F}(\underset{\sim}{x},t) \in C(V \times (0,\infty))$, $\underset{\sim}{f}(\underset{\sim}{x},t) \in C(\partial V_\sigma \times (0,\infty))$, $\underset{\sim}{g}(\underset{\sim}{x},t) \in C^1(\partial V_u \times (0,\infty))$, $\underset{\sim}{h}(\underset{\sim}{x}) \in C(\bar{V})$ and $\underset{\sim}{k}(\underset{\sim}{x}) \in C(\bar{V})$ satisfying the compatibility conditions

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} \underset{\sim}{g}(\underset{\sim}{x},t) = \underset{\sim}{h}(\underset{\sim}{x}), \quad \underset{\sim}{x} \in \partial V_u ,$$

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} \frac{\partial \underset{\sim}{g}(\underset{\sim}{x},t)}{\partial t} = \underset{\sim}{k}(\underset{\sim}{x}), \quad \underset{\sim}{x} \in \partial V_u .$$

Then, there exists at most one set of strains $\varepsilon_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t) \in C^1(\bar{V} \times [0,\infty))$ and stresses $\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t) \in C^1(\bar{V} \times [0,\infty))$ satisfying the general constitutive relation (possibly nonlinear)[1]

$$\varepsilon_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t) = \int_0^t J[\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'), t', t] \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')}{\partial t'} dt' , \tag{2.1}$$

in $\bar{V} \times [0,\infty)$, and the field, boundary and initial conditions

$$\sigma_{ij,j} + F_i = \rho \frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial t^2} , \text{ on } V \times (0,\infty) , \tag{2.2}$$

(where $\rho(x) \in C(\bar{V})$ is the mass density of the medium),

$$\varepsilon_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(u_{i,j} + u_{j,i}) , \text{ in } \bar{V} \times [0,\infty) , \tag{2.3}$$

---

[1] We assume that $\varepsilon_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},0) = \sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},0) = 0$; further discussion of this constitutive relation will be given in Section 3.

$$\sigma_{ij} n_j = f_i \ , \quad \text{on} \quad \partial V_\sigma \times (0,\infty) \ , \tag{2.4}$$

$$u_i = g_i \ , \quad \text{on} \quad \partial V_u \times (0,\infty) \ , \tag{2.5}$$

$$u_i = h_i \ , \quad \text{in} \quad \bar{V} \quad \text{at} \quad t = 0 \ , \tag{2.6}$$

$$\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial t} = k_i \ , \quad \text{in} \quad \bar{V} \text{ at } t = 0 \ , \tag{2.7}$$

provided J satisfies

$$\lim_{\substack{t' \to t \\ t' < t}} J[\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t), t', t] \geq 0 \ , \tag{2.8}$$

$$\lim_{\substack{t' \to t \\ t' < t}} \frac{\partial J}{\partial t} [\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'), t', t] \geq 0 \ , \tag{2.9}$$

and the continuity conditions

$$J[\sigma_{ij}, t', t] \in C^1(D \times (0,\infty) \times (0,\infty))$$

where D is some appropriate range for stresses containing 0, and

$$\frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial t' \partial t} [\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t]$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial \sigma_{k\ell} \partial t} [\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'), t', t] \in C(D \times (0,\infty) \times (0,\infty)) \ .$$

Furthermore, there is at most one displacement vector $\underset{\sim}{u}(\underset{\sim}{x},t) \in C^2(\bar{V} \times [0,\infty))$ defined up to a rigid body displacement.

<u>Proof</u>. The rate of work W of the external forces can be expressed (upon using equations (2.2) and (2.3) and the divergence theorem[1]) as

$$\frac{dW}{dt} = \frac{dK}{dt} + \int_V \sigma_{ij} \frac{\partial \varepsilon_{ij}}{\partial t} \, dv \qquad (2.10)$$

where

$$K = \frac{1}{2} \int_V \rho \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial t} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial t} \, dv \geq 0$$

is the kinetic energy.

Suppose σ^1_{ij}, ε^1_{ij}, u^1_i and σ^2_{ij}, ε^2_{ij}, u^2_i are two sets of solutions to Eqs. (2.1)-(2.7) and consider the difference solution $\sigma_{ij} = \sigma^1_{ij} - \sigma^2_{ij}$, etc. It satisfies equations (2.2)-(2.7) with $\underset{\sim}{F} \equiv \underset{\sim}{f} \equiv \underset{\sim}{g} \equiv \underset{\sim}{h} \equiv \underset{\sim}{k} \equiv \underset{\sim}{0}$. Therefore, for the difference solution, $dW/dt = 0$ and $W(t) = 0$ for all $t \in [0,\infty)$, i.e., integrating (2.10)

$$0 = K(t) + \int_0^t \int_V \sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t') \frac{\partial \varepsilon_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')}{\partial t'} \, dv \, dt' \, . \qquad (2.11)$$

Substituting (2.1) in (2.11) and using Leibniz' rule (which is justified in view of the continuity assumption on J) we obtain

$$0 = K(t) + \int_0^t \int_V \sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t') \Big\{ J[\sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t'] \frac{\partial \sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')}{\partial t'}$$

$$-J[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t'] \frac{\partial \sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')}{\partial t'} + \int_0^{t'} \Big[\frac{\partial J}{\partial t'}[\sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t''),t'',t']$$

---

[1] The divergence theorem can be used in view of the regularity assumption on ∂V.

$$\cdot \frac{\partial\sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')}{\partial t''} - \frac{\partial J}{\partial t'}[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t''),t'',t'] \frac{\partial\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')}{\partial t''}\Bigg]dt''\Bigg\} \, dv \, dt' ,$$

or after regrouping terms (using $\sigma_{ij} = \sigma^1_{ij} - \sigma^2_{ij}$)

$$0 = K(t) + \int_o^t \int_V \sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t') J[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t'] \frac{\partial\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')}{\partial t'} \, dv \, dt'$$
$$+ \int_o^t \int_V \Big\{ J[\sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t'] - J[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t'] \Big\} \frac{\partial\sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')}{\partial t'} \sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t') \, dv \, dt'$$
$$+ \int_o^t \int_V \int_o^{t'} \sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t') \frac{\partial J}{\partial t'}[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t''),t'',t'] \frac{\partial\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')}{\partial t''} \, dt'' \, dv \, dt'$$
$$+ \int_o^t \int_V \int_o^{t'} \Big\{ \frac{\partial J}{\partial t'}[\sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t''),t'',t'] - \frac{\partial J}{\partial t'}[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t''),t'',t'] \Big\} \frac{\partial\sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')}{\partial t''} \sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')$$
$$\cdot \, dt'' \, dv \, dt' \; . \qquad (2.12)$$

Interchanging the order of integration, and integrating by parts (which is justified in view of the continuity assumption on J and σ_{ij}) the first integral in (2.12) becomes

$$\int_V J[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t),t,t] \, I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t) \, dv$$
$$- \int_V \int_o^t \frac{\partial J}{\partial t'}[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t'] \, I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t') dt' \, dv \; , \qquad (2.13)$$

where $I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t) = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t) \sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t)$ is the second invariant of the stress tensor. Since $I_2 \geq 0$ we can use the second law of the mean for the first integral in (2.13) to write (2.13) as

$$C_1 \int_V I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t)\, dv - \int_o^t \int_V \frac{\partial J}{\partial t'}[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t']\, I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\, dv\, dt' , \qquad (2.14)$$

where C_1 is a non-negative function of t in view of assumption (2.8), and order of integration has been changed again.

Using the mean value theorem on the term in brackets[1] in the second integral in (2.12) we can express this second integral as

$$\int_o^t \int_V \frac{\partial J}{\partial \sigma_{k\ell}} [\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t']\, \frac{\partial \sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')}{\partial t'}\, \sigma_{k\ell}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\, dv\, dt', \quad (2.15)$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')$ is some intermediate value between $\sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')$ and $\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')$.

Integrating by parts with respect to t'' the third integral in (2.12) can be written as

$$2 \int_o^t \int_V \frac{\partial J}{\partial t'}[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t''),t'',t']\Big|_{t''=t'} I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\, dv\, dt'$$

$$-\int_o^t \int_V \int_o^{t'} \frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial t''\partial t'}[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t''),t'',t']\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')\, dt''\, dv\, dt'$$

which upon using the second law of the mean for the first integral can be further expressed as

$$2C_2 \int_o^t \int_V I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t')dv\, dt' - \int_o^t \int_V \int_o^{t'} \frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial t''\partial t'}[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t''),t'',t']$$

$$\cdot\, \sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')\, dt''\, dv\, dt' \qquad (2.16)$$

---

[1] Justified in view of the continuity assumptions on J .

where $C_2 \geq 0$ in view of assumption (2.9).

Use of the mean value theorem[1] on the term in brackets in the last integral in (2.12) allows us to write this integral as

$$\int_o^t \int_V \int_o^{t'} \frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial\sigma_{k\ell}\partial t'}[\hat{\sigma}_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t''),t'',t'] \frac{\partial\sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')}{\partial t''} \sigma_{k\ell}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')$$

$$\cdot\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\, dt''\, dv\, dt' \ , \qquad (2.17)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')$ is some intermediate value between $\sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')$ and $\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')$.

Substitution of (2.14)-(2.17) in (2.12) leads to

$$0 = K(t) + C_1 \int_V I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t)dv - \int_o^t \int_V \frac{\partial J}{\partial t'}[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t'] \, I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t')dv\, dt'$$

$$+\int_o^t \int_V \frac{\partial J}{\partial\sigma_{k\ell}}[\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t'] \frac{\partial\sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')}{\partial t'} \sigma_{k\ell}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\, dv\, dt'$$

$$+ 2C_2 \int_o^t \int_V I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t')dv\, dt' - \int_o^t \int_V \int_o^{t'} \frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial t''\partial t'}[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t''),t'',t']$$

$$\cdot\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')\, dt''\, dv\, dt' + \int_o^t \int_V \int_o^{t'} \frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial\sigma_{k\ell}\partial t'}[\hat{\sigma}_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t''),t'',t']$$

$$\cdot\frac{\partial\sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')}{\partial t''} \sigma_{k\ell}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\, dt''\, dv\, dt'$$

which in view of the non-negativeness of K, I_2, C_1 and C_2 yields

---

[1] Justified in view of the continuing assumptions on J .

$$0 \le 2C_2 \int_o^t \int_V I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t')dv\,dt' \le \int_o^t \int_V \frac{\partial J}{\partial t'}[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t']$$

$$\cdot I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t')dv\,dt' + \int_o^t \int_V \int_o^{t'} \frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial t''\partial t'}[\sigma^2_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t''),t'',t']\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')$$

$$\cdot\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')dt''\,dv\,dt' - \int_o^t \int_V \frac{\partial J}{\partial \sigma_{k\ell}}[\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t']\ \frac{\partial \hat{\sigma}_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')}{\partial t'}$$

$$\cdot\sigma_{k\ell}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')dv\,dt' - \int_o^t \int_V \int_o^{t'} \frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial \sigma_{k\ell}\partial t'}[\hat{\sigma}_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t''),t'',t']$$

$$\cdot\frac{\partial \sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')}{\partial t''}\ \sigma_{k\ell}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\ dt''\,dv\,dt' \ . \tag{2.18}$$

Using the standard inequalities for magnitudes $|a\pm b|\le|a|+|b|$ and $|\int f|\le\int|f|$, and the continuity assumptions on J , the right hand side of the second inequality in (2.18) is bounded by

$$C_3 \int_o^t \int_V I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t')dv\,dt' + C_4 \int_o^t \int_V \int_o^{t'} |\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')|dt''\,dv\,dt'$$

$$+\int_o^t \int_V \left|\frac{\partial J}{\partial \sigma_{k\ell}}[\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t']\right| \left|\frac{\partial \sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')}{\partial t'}\right| \left|\sigma_{k\ell}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\right| dv\,dt'$$

$$+\int_o^t \int_V \int_o^{t'} \left|\frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial \sigma_{k\ell}\partial t'}[\hat{\sigma}_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t''),t'',t']\right| \left|\frac{\partial \sigma^1_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')}{\partial t''}\right| \left|\sigma_{k\ell}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\right| dt''\,dv\,dt' \tag{2.19}$$

where C_3 and C_4 are positive constants (the existence of which is guaranteed by the continuity assumption on J) such that for $t',t'' \in (0,t)$

$$\left|\frac{\partial J}{\partial t'}[\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t']\right| \le C_3 , \quad \left|\frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial t''\partial t'}[\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t''),t'',t']\right| \le C_4 .$$

Let A_{ij}, B_{ij}, $i,j = 1,2,3$, be constants such that

$$\left|\frac{\partial J}{\partial \sigma_{ij}}\right| \le A_{ij} \ , \quad \left|\frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial t}\right| \le B_{ij} \ .$$

(The existence of such constants is guaranteed by the continuity assumptions on J and σ.) Then, the integrand of the third term in (2.19) is bounded by

$$A_{k\ell} \left| \sigma_{k\ell} \right| B_{ij} \left| \sigma_{ij} \right| ,$$

itself bounded by

$$AB\Big(\sum_{i,j=1}^{3} |\sigma_{ij}| \Big)^2$$

where

$$A = \max_{i,j} A_{ij} , \quad B = \max_{i,j} B_{ij} .$$

Since via Cauchy's inequality $\Big(\sum_{i,j=1}^{3} |\sigma_{ij}| \Big)^2 \leq 9 \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} |\sigma_{ij}|^2 = 18\, I_2$, the third term in (2.19) is bounded by

$$C_5 \int_0^t \int_V I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\, dv\, dt'$$

where $C_5 = 18AB$ is a positive constant.

Similarly, invoking the boundedness of $\left| \frac{\partial^2 J(\sigma,t',t)}{\partial\sigma_{ij}\partial t} \right|$ (which follows from continuity assumptions), one can bound the last term in (2.19) by

$$C_6 \int_0^t \int_V \int_0^{t'} \left| \sum_{k,\ell=1}^{3} \sigma_{k\ell}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'') \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t') \right| dt''\, dv\, dt'$$

where $C_6 > 0$.

Consequently, (2.19) is bounded by

$$C_3 \int_o^t \int_V I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t')dv\,dt' + C_4 \int_o^t \int_V \int_o^{t'} \left|\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')\right| dt''\,dv\,dt'$$

$$+C_5 \int_o^t \int_V I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t')dv\,dt' + C_6 \int_o^t \int_V \int_o^{t'} \left| \sum_{k,\ell=1}^{3} \sigma_{k\ell}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'') \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t') \right| dt''\,dv\,dt'. \tag{2.20}$$

Making use of the Schwarz inequality corresponding to the inner product $(f,g) = \int_V f_{ij}\, g_{ij}\, dv$ for second rank tensor fields f,g, and interchanging the order of integration, the second term in (2.20) is bounded by

$$C_4 \int_o^t \int_o^{t'} \left(\int_V 2I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t')dv\right)^{1/2} \left(\int_V 2I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')dv\right)^{1/2} dt''\,dt'.$$

Similarly, recalling $(\sum \sigma_{ij})^2 \leq 18I_2$, the last term in (2.20) is bounded by

$$C_6 \int_o^t \int_o^{t'} \left(\int_V 18I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t')dv\right)^{1/2} \left(\int 18I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t'')dv\right)^{1/2} dt''dt'.$$

Thus, from (2.18), (2.20) and the above bounds we obtain, upon setting

$$v^2(t) = \int_V I_2(\underset{\sim}{x},t)dv ,$$

$$2C_2 \int_o^t v^2(t')dt' \leq (C_3 + C_5) \int_o^t v^2(t')dt'$$

$$+ 2(C_4 + 9C_6) \int_o^t \int_o^{t'} v(t')\, v(t'')\, dt''\, dt' ,$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\int_0^t v^2(t')dt' \leq C \int_0^t v(t') \left[v(t') + \int_0^{t'} v(t'')dt'' \right] dt' \ , \tag{2.21}$$

where $C = \max\left\{ (C_3 + C_5)/2C_2 \ , \ (C_4 + 9C_6)/C_2 \right\}$.

Since inequality (2.21) holds for any $t \in [0,\infty)$, since $v(o) = 0$, and in view of the continuity of the integrands in (2.21) there must exist a $T > 0$ such that for $t' \leq T$.

$$v^2(t') \leq C\, v(t') \left[v(t') + \int_0^{t'} v(t'')\, dt'' \right] dt'$$

or

$$z(t') \leq \kappa \int_0^{t'} z(t'')\, dt'' \tag{2.22}$$

where $z(t) = (1-C)\, v(t)$ and $\kappa = C/(1-C)$.

It follows from (2.22) and Gronwall's inequality[1] that $z(t') = 0$, $0 \leq t' \leq T$, and so $v(t') = 0$, that is

$$\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t') \equiv 0 \ , \quad (\underset{\sim}{x},t') \in \bar{V} \times [0,T].$$

But then we have equality in (2.21) for $t' \in [0,T]$, and so there must exist a $T' > T$ such that for $t' \in [0,T']$ (2.22) holds, which implies $\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t') \equiv 0$ for $t' \in [0,T']$, and so on to prove

$$\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t) \equiv 0 \ , \quad (\underset{\sim}{x},t) \in \bar{V} \times [0,\infty] \ ,$$

---

[1] Details on Gronwall's inequality, as well as the various other inequalities used in this proof, are given in [11].

i.e., the stresses are unique. The uniqueness of the strains follows from that of the stresses and (2.1) while uniqueness (up to a rigid body displacement) of the displacement vector follows from that of the strains and (2.3), (2.5), and (2.6)-(2.7). This completes the proof of the theorem.

Remark 2.1. Conditions (2.8)-(2.9) as well as the continuity assumptions on the creep function J are sufficient for uniqueness but not necessary, as they are sufficient but not necessary to carry out some of the steps in the proof: integration by parts, use of the mean value theorem, etc.

Remark 2.2. Conditions (2.8) and (2.9) are conditions on the instantaneous response of the material. The conditions that $\frac{\partial J}{\partial t}[\sigma_{ij},t,t]$ and $\frac{\partial J}{\partial \sigma_{k\ell}}[\sigma_{ij},t,t]$ be continuous in σ_{ij} and t, used to carry out the steps leading to (2.13), (2.15) and (2.20) and which are satisfied when J satisfies the continuity hypotheses of the Theorem, are also conditions on the instantaneous response of the material. Note that no other conditions are imposed on the instantaneous response which can be linear or nonlinear elastic, include thermal expansion and irradiation swelling (cf. Section 3 below), etc.

Remark 2.3. The constitutive relation (2.1) is general enough to include many constitutive relations proposed to date (cf. Section 3 below).

Remark 2.4. The problem considered is only mildly nonlinear in the sense that only the constitutive relation (2.1) is nonlinear but the field equations and boundary and initial conditions are linear. The above Theorem will apply to uncoupled nonlinear thermoviscoelasticity and/or uncoupled irradioviscoelasticity (cf. Section 3 below). For the coupled

problems however nonlinearity in the field equations would appear and the Theorem would not apply.

Remark 2.5. When the constitutive relation (2.1) is linear the Theorem provides an alternate uniqueness theorem for linear viscoelasticity. However the proof can be greatly simplified in this case since $J[\sigma^1_{ij},t't] - J[\sigma^2_{ij},t't] = J[\sigma_{ij},t't]$. Incidentally, this last relationship was tacitly and erroneously assumed in the proof of the uniqueness theorem in [8]. The proof given here provides a correct substitute.

3 - Application to temperature and irradiation induced creep.

In [9] Cozzarelli and Huang proposed a constitutive relation for thermoirradiation induced creep which includes as a particular case a nonlinear constitutive equation of the isotropic power law type in terms of memory integrals (cf. equation (41) in [9]). We first extend this constitutive relation so as to include aging effects through a time hardening procedure similar to that of [10] and thereby obtain an expression in the form of equation (2.1). Then we specialize the general uniqueness theorem of Section 2 to the constitutive relation so obtained thereby obtaining some restrictions on the various material constants appearing in the relation.

The strain-stress relationship to be considered can be written as

$$\varepsilon_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}[\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t),t]}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} \tag{3.1}$$

where the energy functional $\mathcal{E}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E} = U_{TE} &+ \sigma_{ij} \int_0^t [\eta_T(t) - \eta_T(t')] \frac{\partial}{\partial t'} \left(\frac{\partial U_{TS}}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} \right) dt' \\
&+ \sigma_{ij} \sum_{k=1}^{M} \int_0^t \left\{ 1 - \exp[-A_T^{(k)}(\eta_T(t) - \eta_T(t'))] \right\} \\
&\cdot \left\{ a_T^{(k)} + (1-a_T^{(k)}) \exp[-A_T^{(k)} \eta_T(t')] \right\} \frac{\partial}{\partial t'} \left(\frac{\partial U_{TT}^{(k)}}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} \right) dt' \\
&+ \sigma_{ij} \int_0^t [\eta_R(t) - \eta_R(t')] \frac{\partial}{\partial t'} \left(\frac{\partial U_{RS}}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} \right) dt'
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sigma_{ij} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \int_{o}^{t} \left\{ 1 - \exp[-A_R^{(k)} (\eta_R(t) - \eta_R(t'))] \right\}$$

$$\cdot \left\{ a_R^{(k)} + (1-a_R^{(k)}) \exp[-A_R^{(k)} \ \eta_R(t')] \right\} \frac{\partial}{\partial t'} \left(\frac{\partial U_{RT}^{(k)}}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} \right) dt' \tag{3.2}$$

and where

$$U_{TE} = \frac{1+\nu_E}{E} \left[I_2 - \frac{\nu_E}{2(1+\nu_E)} I_1^2 \right] + (\alpha_T \theta + \alpha_R n) \ I_1 \ , \tag{3.3a}$$

$$U_{TS} = \frac{C_{TS}}{M_{TS}+1} \left[I_2 - \frac{\nu_{TS}}{2(1+\nu_{TS})} I_1^2 \right]^{M_{TS}+1} , \tag{3.3b}$$

$$U_{TT}^{(k)} = \frac{C_{TT}^{(k)}}{M_{TT}^{(k)}+1} \left[I_2 - \frac{\nu_{TT}^{(k)}}{2(1+\nu_{TT}^{(k)})} I_1^2 \right]^{M_{TT}^{(k)}+1} , \quad k=1,\ldots,M, \tag{3.3c}$$

$$U_{RS} = \frac{C_{RS}}{M_{RS}+1} \left[I_2 - \frac{\nu_{RS}}{2(1+\nu_{RS})} I_1^2 \right]^{M_{RS}+1} , \tag{3.3d}$$

$$U_{RT}^{(k)} = \frac{C_{RT}^{(k)}}{M_{RT}^{(k)}+1} \left[I_2 - \frac{\nu_{RT}^{(k)}}{2(1+\nu_{RT}^{(k)})} I_1^2 \right]^{M_{RT}^{(k)}+1} , \quad k=1,\ldots,N, \tag{3.3e}$$

are respectively the thermoirradioelastic, steady thermal creep, transient thermal creep, steady irradiation creep, transient irradiation creep complementary potentials. In equations (3.3) $I_1 = \sigma_{ii}$ and $I_2 = \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{ij}\ \sigma_{ij}$ are respectively the first and second invariants of the stress tensor; E is the elastic modulus, ν_E is Poisson's ratio, α_T and α_R are the coefficients of thermal expansion and swelling respectively; θ is the temperature measured from some constant reference and n is the imperfection density increment from some constant reference; C_{TS}, $C_{TT}^{(k)}$'s, C_{RS}, $C_{RT}^{(k)}$'s, M_{TS}, $M_{TT}^{(k)}$'s, M_{RS}, $M_{RT}^{(k)}$'s, ν_{TS}, $\nu_{TT}^{(k)}$'s, ν_{RS} and $\nu_{RT}^{(k)}$'s are material constants, the first four

being positive and the next four being non-negative integers.

In equation (3.2) $a_T^{(k)}$ and $a_R^{(k)}$ are the thermal and irradiation hardening parameters respectively; $A_T^{(k)}$ and $A_R^{(k)}$ are constants the reciprocal of which are analogous to retardation times. Finally, $\eta_T(t)$ and $\eta_R(t)$ are the thermal and irradiation reduced times which account for temperature and flux dependent material properties; they are defined as

$$\eta_T = \int_0^t \Phi_T[T(\tau)]\ \Psi_T[\dot{n}(\tau)]d\tau\ , \quad \eta_R = \int_0^t \Phi_R[T(\tau)]\ \Psi_R[\dot{n}(\tau)]\ d\tau$$

where Φ_R and Φ_T are functions of temperature T, and Ψ_R and Ψ_T are functions of the time rate of change of the imperfection density $\dot{n}$ (and hence of neutron flux).

Substituting (3.3) in (3.2) and (3.2) in (3.1) yields

$$\epsilon_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t) = \int_0^t J[\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t]\ \frac{\partial\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')}{\partial t'}\ dt' \tag{3.4}$$

which is identical to equation (2.1) with

$$J[\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t'),t',t] = \frac{\partial^2 U_{TE}[\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')]}{\partial\sigma_{ij}^2} + [\eta_T(t) - \eta_T(t')]\ \frac{\partial^2 U_{TS}[\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')]}{\partial\sigma_{ij}^2}$$

$$+ \sum_{k=1}^{M}\left\{1-\exp[-A_T^{(k)}(\eta_T(t) - \eta_T(t'))]\right\}\left\{a_T^{(k)} + (1-a_T^{(k)})\right.$$

$$\left.\cdot\exp[-A_T^{(k)}\eta_T(t')]\right\}\ \frac{\partial^2 U_{TT}^{(k)}[\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')]}{\partial\sigma_{ij}^2} + [\eta_R(t)-\eta_R(t')]\ \frac{\partial^2 U_{RS}[\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')]}{\partial\sigma_{ij}^2}$$

$$+ \sum_{k=1}^{N}\left\{1-\exp[-A_R^{(k)}(\eta_R(t) - \eta_R(t'))]\right\}\left\{a_R^{(k)} + (1-a_R^{(k)})\exp[-A_R^{(k)}\right.$$

$$\cdot \eta_R(t')]\Big\} \quad \frac{\partial^2 U_{RT}^{(k)}[\sigma_{ij}(\underset{\sim}{x},t')]}{\partial \sigma_{ij}^{\,2}} \tag{3.5}$$

being the thermoirradiation induced creep function. Equation (3.1) with ξ given by (3.2) is an extension of constitutive relation (41) in [9] which includes aging effects through time hardening.

It is now easy to check that J as given by equation (3.5) satisfies all the hypotheses of the uniqueness theorem of Section 2 provided.

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}
-1 < \nu_E,\ \nu_{RS},\ \nu_{TS},\ \nu_{RT},\ \nu_{TT} \leq \frac{1}{2}\ , \\[2ex]
E \geq 0\ , \\[2ex]
A_T^k \geq 0,\quad a_T^{(k)} \geq 0\ ,\quad k=1,\ldots,M\ , \\[2ex]
A_R^{(k)} \geq 0,\quad a_R^{(k)} \geq 0\ ,k=1,\ldots,N\ , \\[2ex]
\frac{d\eta_T}{dt} \geq 0\ ,\quad \frac{d\eta_R}{dt} \geq 0\ .
\end{array}\right\} \tag{3.6}$$

<u>Remark 4.1</u>. The constants ν_{RS}, ν_{TS}, ν_{RT}, ν_{TT} are analogous to Poisson's ratio ν_E [9]. Consequently the requirement that they be greater than -1 and less than or equal to 1/2 is quite natural.

<u>Remark 4.2</u>. The conditions $a_T^{(k)}$, $a_R^{(k)} \geq 0$ are weaker than the physical conditions $0 \leq a_T^{(k)}$, $a_R^{(k)} \leq 1$ given in [10].

<u>Remark 4.3</u>. The non decreasingness assumption on η_T and η_R will be satisfied if in particular $\Phi_T\ \Psi_T \geq 0$ and $\Phi_R\ \Psi_R \geq 0$, which is observed experimentally [9]. Furthermore, when one introduces a

reduced time one would normally expect a one to one correspondance between real time and reduced time [12], and thus one would normally assume that the reduced time is a strictly monotone function of real time.

Finally, we should note that constitutive relations in the form of equation (2.1) [also (3.4)] are often termed modified (i.e., nonlinear) superposition integrals (with aging included), and arise in continuum mechanical studies of many viscoelastic materials including polymers, concrete and metals at elevated temperatures. Thus one could also easily specialize the uniqueness theorem of Section 2 to a wide variety of other constitutive relations which have been presented in the literature. Such relations were first proposed some years ago (see Leaderman [13], Rabotnov [14] (somewhat different form) and Arutyunyan [15]), although during the last ten years they have received renewed attention (see [9,10], Schapery [16], Findley and Lai [17], Pipkins and Rogers [18], Rabotnov, Papernik and Stepanychev [19], Stouffer [20], Distefano and Fodeschini [21] and Rashid [22]).

References

1. M.E. Gurtin and E. Sternberg, On the Linear Theory of Viscoelasticity, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 11, 291 (1962).

2. W.S. Edelstein and M.E. Gurtin, Uniqueness Theorems in the Linear Dynamic Theory of Anisotropic Viscoelastic Solids, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 17, 47 (1964).

3. F. Odeh, and I. Tadjbakhsh, Uniqueness in the Linear Theory of Viscoelasticity, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 18, 244 (1965).

4. J. Lubliner and J. L. Sackman, On Uniqueness in General Linear Viscoelasticity, Quart. Appl. Math. 25, 129 (1967).

5. J.L. Sackman, A Uniqueness Theorem for a Nonlinear Steadily Creeping Body, SIAM Review 9, 741 (1967).

6. W.S. Edelstein, On Uniqueness of Solutions for Nonlinear Creep Problems in Symmetric Pressure Vessels, Int. J. Solids Structures 13, 599 (1977).

7. W.S. Edelstein, On Uniqueness of Solutions for Secondary Creep Problems, Int. J. Solids Structures 13, 807 (1977).

8. G.A. Bécus, A Uniqueness Theorem in Non-Linear Viscoelasticity, Int. J. Non-Linear Mech. 12, 147 (1977).

9. F.A. Cozzarelli and S. Huang, On the Analogy Between Thermally and Irradiation Induced Creep, Nuclear Eng. and Design 42, 409 (1977).

10. F.A. Cozzarelli and R.P. Shaw, A Combined Strain and Time-Hardening Non-Linear Creep Law, Int. J. Non-Linear Mech. 7, 221 (1972).

11. D.S. Mitrinović, Analytical Inequalities, Springer-Verlag, New York (1970).

12. L.W. Morland and E.H. Lee, Stress Analysis for Linear Viscoelastic Materials with Temperature Variation, Trans. Soc. Rheol. 4, 233 (1960).

13. H. Leaderman, Elastic and Creep Properties of Filamentous Materials and other High Polymers, The Textile Foundation, Washington, D.C. (1943).

14. Y. N. Rabotnov, Some Problems on the Theory of Creep, N.A.C.A. Tech. Memo 1353 (1948).

15. N.K. Arutyunyan, Some Problems of Creep Theory, Gostekhizdat, Moscov (1952).

16. R.A. Schapery, A Theory of Non-Linear Thermoviscoelasticity Based on Irreversible Thermodynamics, Proc. 5th U.S. National Congress of Applied Mechanics, 511 (1966).

17. W.N. Findley and J.S.Y. Lai, A Modified Superposition Principle Applied to Creep of Nonlinear Viscoelastic Material under Abrupt Changes in State of Combined Stress, Soc. Rheol. 11, 361 (1967).

18. A.C. Pipkin and F.G. Rogers, A Nonlinear Integral Representation for Viscoelastic Behavior, Mech. Phys. Solids 16, 59 (1968).

19. Y.N. Rabotnov, L.K. Papernik and E. Stepanychev, Application of Nonlinear Theory of Hereditary to Description of Time Effects in Polymeric Materials, Mechanics of Polymers No. 1, 74 (1971) (In Russian).

20. D.C. Stouffer, A Single Integral Constitutive Law for Weak Non-Linear Viscoelastic Solids, Int. J. Non-Linear Mech. 7, 465 (1972).

21. N. Distefano and R. Todeschini, Modeling, Identification and Prediction of a Class of Nonlinear Viscoelastic Materials (I), Int. J. Solids Structures 9, 805 (1973).

22. Y.R. Rashid, Mathematical Modeling and Analysis of Fuel Rods, Nuclear Eng. and Design 29, 22 (1974).

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER (6) (14) 112	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) A GENERAL UNIQUENESS THEOREM IN NONLINEAR VISCOELASTICITY WITH APPLICATION TO TEMPERATURE AND IRRADIATION INDUCED CREEP PROBLEMS		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED (9) Summary rept.
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) (10) Georges A./Bécus ~~and~~ F.A./Cozzarelli		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) (15) N00014-75-C-Ø3Ø2
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Department of Engineering Science Faculty of Engineering and Applied Sciences State Univ. of NY at Buffalo, Buffalo NY 14214		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS (11)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Office of Naval Research--Structural Mechanics, Washington, D.C.		12. REPORT DATE August, 1979
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 21
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified (12) 23
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for Public Release. Distribution Unlimited

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

uniqueness theorem, nonlinear viscoelasticity, thermal creep, irradiation creep

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

A general uniqueness theorem is first derived for a general constitutive relation in the form of a nonlinear memory integral with aging included. Uniqueness is proved for the solution to the dynamic mixed boundary value problem with small deformations. The general theorem is then specialized to a constitutive equation of the isotropic power law type governing thermoirradiation induced creep. 406 156

JOB

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)